DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 849 TM 031 49

AUTHOR Newman, Isadore
TITLE A Conceptualization of Mixed Methods: A Need for Inductive/Deductive Approach to Conducting Research.
PUB DATE 2000-04-00
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-25, 2000).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Deduction; Hypothesis Testing; *Induction; *Qualitative Research; *Research Methodology; *Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Mixed Method Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This paper provides examples of how one can use the research issue and the relationships between qualitative and quantitative research as a frame for instructing students and judging the quality of research. The emphasis is on validity estimates, also called legitimization techniques, with attention to the idea of a qualitative-quantitative research continuum. It is not the technique that makes something quantitative or qualitative, but rather the intention of its use. The question is posed whether the research is testing hypotheses, helping to develop hypotheses, or describing the data. Criteria have been developed by Y. Lincoln and E. Guba (1985) for the validity of qualitative research so that it can be evaluated in a way similar to the more common evaluation of quantitative research. In fact, much of all research is a blend of quantitative and qualitative approaches. The more aware researchers are of this fact, the more likely it is that standards of good and effective research can be established. (Contains 21 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 443 849

A Conceptualization of Mixed Methods: A Need for Inductive/Deductive Approach to Conducting Research

Isadore Newman, Ph.D.
The University of Akron

I. Newman

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TM031494

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New Orleans, LA, April 2000.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Conceptualization of Mixed Methods: A Need for Inductive/Deductive Approach to Conducting Research*

Isadore Newman, Ph.D.
The University of Akron

Introduction: The purpose of this paper is to give examples of how one can use the research issues and interrelationships between qualitative or quantitative research as a frame for instructing students and judging the quality of research. (The intent is not to present an in depth discussion of the two underlying epistemologies.) Cook & Reichardt (1979) pre-date our work, and like us suggest that the researcher's method can be separated from his or her philosophical perception of the world. In 1980, Patton presented a diagram he called a mixed paradigms. His book acknowledges a qualitative-quantitative continuum, however he only addressed qualitative methods and did not emphasize ways to critique research. Creswell (1994) also discussed qualitative and quantitative approaches, but did not discuss how to critique research. The emphasis of our approach is on validity estimates, also called legitimization techniques, which allows one to estimate and improve the validity of their research, whether it is called qualitative or quantitative. And finally, the emphasis is on the notion of a qualitative-quantitative research continuum, as opposed to a dichotomy, which is more consistent with a coherent philosophy of science.

---

*Presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting at New Orleans, LA, April 2000.

Quantitative research from a positivistic approach frequently assumes that hypotheses are derived from some theory or hypothetical construct, and are therefore deductive in nature and are sometimes referred to as theory testing. A summary of this concept may be conceptualized as going from:

Theory -> General Hypotheses -> Specific Hypotheses -> Data Collection -> Data Analysis -> Results -> Conclusion -> Theory Confirmation/Revision.

On the other hand, a qualitative or constructivist approach to research may be considered inductive and the purpose is not to test theory but to generate theory and explanations of phenomena. This can be conceptualized as starting with:

Data Collection-> Data Analysis-> Conclusions-> Development of Hypotheses-> leading to Theory Development.

Obviously, these methods are most appropriate for answering different questions. For example, if your questions are to test differences, to generalize (to infer from the sample to a population), or to test theory, you are more likely to be doing quantitative research and the research methodology tends to be pre-experimental, quasi-experimental, true-experimental or expost-facto research designs. This would include many path- analytic studies. Some of the assumptions of these methods are that data can be collected value free, there is independence of

measurements, and an objective reality exists. Therefore, one can make generalizations.

If the intent is to describe, to uncover deep meaning, to explain, or to build theory, you are more likely to be interested in conducting qualitative research. Generally, research methods associated with these types of questions tend to be case studies, field studies, historiographic, ethnographic, anthropological, document, and phenomenological. These methods assume that all data is value laden, context embedded, subjects and objects are dependent, everything is relative, and there is no objective reality. Therefore, neutrality of data is not possible and one cannot generalize.

Quantitative research starts with some theoretical or hypothetical construct from which hypotheses are derived. The theory is an outgrowth of qualitative conceptualizations. The point is that one can not do qualitative research that is independent of some previously developed qualitative concepts. While quantitative research, which is based on positivistic philosophy, strives to be objective, it contains many subjective aspects. For example, the selection of a subjective alpha level, directionality of hypotheses, and the interpretation and implication of data all have subjective qualities.

Confusion between "Qualitative and Quantitative Methods" and "Qualitative and Quantitative Research."

There is a frequently help misconception that quantitative research uses numbers and qualitative research is narrative. This is a misleading over simplification. As stated above, qualitative research starts with data,

analyzes the data, makes conclusions, and ends with developing hypotheses and/or theory. Exploratory factor analysis, which is a sophisticated statistical technique, starts with the data, analyzes the data, interprets the data (conclusions) and infers the underlying constructs that the set of data is measuring (hypothesized or theoretical underlying dimensions). Therefore, by definition, Exploratory Factor Analysis is isomorphic with the intent and procedures of qualitative analysis. On the other hand, Confirmatory Factor Analysis, which is virtually statistically identical, actually tests to determine if the derived factors fit the hypothesized factors. Therefore, Confirmatory Factory Analysis begins with the hypothesized factors, collects data, analyzes the data, makes conclusions about the match between the observed and hypothesized factor. This is isomorphic with the intent and procedures of quantitative research.

One can also make the same argument for the use of interview data, which can legitimately be used as a data source in qualitative or quantitative research. <u>The point that is being made is that it is not the technique that makes something quantitative or qualitative, but it is the intent of its uses. Is it testing hypotheses or is it helping to develop hypotheses or describe the data</u>.

Differences Between Mixed Philosophies versus Mixed Methods:

Logically, one can not simultaneously hold two philosophical positions that have contradictory assumptions. This does not mean one can not simultaneously use mixed methods for any particular study.

Gueulette, Newgent, & Newman (2000) reviewed the definitions of qualitative and quantitative research presented by Soltis (1990), Miles and Huberman (1984), Eisner & Peshkin (1990), Gay (1992), Rubinowitz & Weseen (1997), Hoshmond (1990), Newman & Benz (1998) and others. Based upon the Gueulette et al review, they developed criteria for classifying research as being quantitative or qualitative. These criteria were then used to evaluate 379 references that had been identified by the authors, journals or index as qualitative research. Out of this sample of 379 references, 44.06% (167) were identified as being a blend of qualitative and quantitative methods, even though they were originally classified only as qualitative research. It becomes evident from their work that the literature is very unclear about what they identify as qualitative or quantitative research.

All research should theoretically or logically be able to be classified as being well done or poorly done. Therefore, a need for standards of quality is necessary. In quantitative research, generally accepted standards for evaluating the quality of research have been presented by Campbell and Stanley (1963) and Campbell & Cook, (1979). These standards relate to the internal and external validity of the research design. For qualitative research, there tends to be less agreement as to what is good research, to the extent that some prominent qualitative researchers (Schwandt, 1990) would say that standards are inappropriate. Others might say that good qualitative research is less dependent on the methods and more related to the telling of the story.

Goetz and LeCompte (1984), Newman & Newman (1994), Newman & Benz (1998), Guba & Lincoln (1985), Lincoln (1995), Tashakkori & Teddlie (1998) and Denzin (1994) have supported the need for standards

for qualitative research. A list, which should not be considered exhaustive, has been suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985), and added to by others. This list provides a foundation for developing standards to evaluate the quality of qualitative research in a way that is similar to the Campbell and Stanley criteria for quantitative research.

The Campbell and Stanley criteria for quantitative research includes:
Threats to Internal Validity: History, Maturation, Testing Effects, Statistical Regression, Experimental Mortality, Selection Bias, Instrumentation (Content, Expert Judge, Face, Concurrent, Predictive and Construct Validity, Test-Retest Reliability, Equivalent Forms, Internal Consistency).
Threats to External Validity: Interaction of selection and treatment, Interaction of setting and treatment; Interaction of history and treatment; Reactive arrangements, etc.

For qualitative research there are 15 criteria suggested mainly by Lincoln and Guba (1985). These are:

> Neutrality, Prolonged Engagement, Persistent Observation, Peer Debriefing, Triangulation, Member Checking, Structural Relationships, Theoretical Sampling, Audit Trail, Negative Case Analysis, Thick Descriptors, Referential Adequacy, Overlapped Methods, Step-wise Replication, and Reflective Journal Writing.

There are many well understood available examples demonstrating the use of Campbell and Stanley criteria for evaluating quantitative research but there are less available examples demonstrating the application of the above considerations to qualitative research. Therefore, what follows is an example of how one can use qualitative criteria in a

similar manner to help evaluate the quality of qualitative research. The example comes from an article critique by Newman & Benz (1998) of a case study of the aftermath of a student's suicide at a middle school. It concludes with a heading called Reflections, which is a section that asks the person critiquing the article to suggest what could or should be done quantitatively, following the qualitative analysis. The critique addresses the authors use or lack of use of the several qualitative methods listed.

Neutrality: Since there was one observer and there was no attempt to control for subjective perceptions and personal biases, it is our estimate that this article was weak in the neutrality criterion.

Prolonged On-Site Engagement: The researchers met this criterion since the author /researcher was a counselor on-site prior to the suicide and for at least 12 weeks following the suicide.

Persistent Observation: The author infers that there was an increase in suicide ideation after the suicide incident. However, there were no pre-assessment of suicide ideation and no attempt to collect data on which these inferences could be made. Therefore, it is assumed that this criterion is weak or was not met.

Peer De-briefing: According to the data presented in the article, there appeared to be no attempt to confirm perceptions and interpretations with other psychologists, counselors, social workers, or any other mental health workers.

Triangulation: It did not appear that there was any attempt to tap information from other sources such as mental health records, school records, parents, etc.

Member Checking: Based upon interviews with students the counselor identified emerging themes that she did not proceed to check in any consistent fashion.

Structural Relationships: There was a minor attempt to explain some of the behaviors of students from a Gestalt theoretical perspective. However, the author did not interweave different data to develop the theoretical (structural) conceptualization.

Theoretical Sampling: There was no attempt at soft hypotheses testing. That is no hypotheses were developed based upon the existing data, and no additional data was collected to determine if hypotheses were supported.

Leaving an Audit Trail: It is possible that the short format of the journal article did not allow for presentation of all data sources. Only the author's subjective perceptions were presented.

Generalizability: Appropriately there was no attempt in this article to generalize. The author was poor in providing deep descriptors, that is detailed descriptions of the subjects, situation, and the culture of the school. There also appeared to be no attempt at negative case analysis, that is there was no attempt to explain outliers from their particular perspective.

Truth Value, Credibility, Confidence In the Research: The stated purpose of the article was to demonstrate the effectiveness of a Gestalt therapeutic approach in helping student suffering from trauma do to a peer's suicide. Based upon the above criteria, it would be difficult to conclude anything about the relative effectiveness of the Gestalt approach.

Reflections: Using the qualitative/quantitative interactive continuum as a guide, one could use the themes that emerged from this case study in future research to evaluate the effectiveness of treatments by randomly assigning students to different treatment groups such as Gestalt, behavioral, psychoanalytic, etc. This quantitative procedure would then build on the heuristic and descriptive qualitative findings to enhance the researcher's ability to estimate the effectiveness of a particular treatment.

Conclusion: As stated in Newman and Benz (1998) and supported by the review of the literature presented by Gueulette, Newgent, & Newman (2000) much of all research tends to be blends (mixed models, qualitative/quantitative). Researchers needs to recognize that to build knowledge for any discipline or field one must be willing to use both quantitative and qualitative methods as appropriate. As Newman and Benz indicated, each approach can provide insights on which the other methods can build (reflectiveness).

It is impossible for me to think of doing a quantitative study without making a significant number of qualitative judgements. To the extent that researchers are aware of this, the more likely it is that standards of good and effective research can be established. This acceptance of the need for both conceptualizations will decrease wasted time that is spent in arguing about a dichotomy that is neither fruitful or effective. The emphases should be on identifying and clearly stating the research questions of interest and the most appropriate methods for answering those questions. This requires researchers to know the strengths and weaknesses of each. The approach suggested in this paper will lead to the improved research and improved training of future researchers.

References

Benz, C. & Newman, I. (1986). *Qualitative-quantitative interactive continuum: A model and application to teacher education evaluation.* Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education meeting, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 269 406).

Campbell, D.T., & Stanley, J.C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Cook, T.D. & Reichardt, C.S. (1979). *Qualitative and quantitative methods in evaluation research.* Beverly Hills, CA:Sage.

Creswell, J.W. (1944) *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Thousands Oaks, CA:Sage.

Denzin, N.K. (1994). Evaluating qualitative research in the poststructural moment:The lessons James Joyce teaches us. *Qualitative Studies in Education,*7(4), 295-308.

Eisner, E.W & Peshkin, A. (Eds.) (1990). *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Gay, L.R. (1987). *Educational research:Competencies for analysis and application.* (3rd ed.) Columbus, OH:Merrill.

Gueulette, C.M., Newgent, R.A., & Newman, I. (2000, Feb.) *Qualitative research:The illegitimatization of intent and purpose.* Paper presented at the Association for Advancement of Educational Research annual meeting, Ponte Verde, FL.

Hoshmond, L. (1999). Locating the qualitative research genre. In M. Kopala & L.A. Suzki (Eds.) *Using qualitative methods in psychology.* (pp. 15). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

LeCompte, M.D., & Goetz, J.P. (1982). Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research. *Review of Educational Research,* 52(1), 31-60.

Lincoln, Y.S., (1990). Toward a categorical imperative for qualitative research. In E.W. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.) *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate* (pp.277-295). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lincoln, Y.S., (1995). Emerging criteria for quality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 1* (3), 275-289.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1984). Drawing valid meaning from qualitative data:Toward a shared craft. *Educational Researcher, 13*(5), 20-30.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook (2nd ed.)* Thousand oaks, CA: Sage.

Newman, I. & Benz, C. *Qualitative-quantitative research methodology: Exploring the interactive continuum.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Patton, M.Q. (1990) *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.).* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Reichardt, C.S., & Cook, T.D. (1979). Beyond qualitative *versus* quantitative methods. In T.D. Cook & C.S. Reichardt (Eds.) *Qualitative and quantitative methods in evaluation research* (pp. 7-32). Beverly Hills, CA:Sage.

Schratz, M. (Ed.). (1993). *Qualitative voices in educational research.* London: Palmer Press.

Spradley, J.P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview.* New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.

Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (1998). Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.